

(2) "The committee are not prepared to report in favor of withholding fellowship from local churches, on the ground of their sustaining ecclesiastical relations to bodies that do not bear open and faithful testimony against slavery—the local churches giving at the same time every suitable evidence of their own hostility to slavery."

(3) "The committee are not prepared to report against extending the ordinary courtesies of ministerial fellowship to ministers who are themselves out-and-out abolitionists, because they are ecclesiastically connected with bodies that do not bear open and faithful testimony against slavery, or because they preach to churches of the same character."

"This the com. submit cannot consistently be done so long (1) as it is a question in dispute among honest men, whether the retaining of such relations is not the best means of exerting an anti-slavery influence, and (2) so long, as it is doubtful, whether the relation being admitted to be a wrong one, the individual sustaining it has light on the subject."

"The com. believe that the questions here involved are unsettled, and therefore call for discussion, rather than for prescriptive action; and that it would be too hasty to withhold fellowship in these cases, for this is a measure, which presupposes that the principles involved are no longer honestly disputed, and also that the persons concerned are duly enlightened in regard to them."

The above report was acted upon, section by section, and adopted, with but three dissenting votes. Of those dissenting, two withdrew at the next meeting of the church.

Whether or not the present position of this church, even if from all participation in the sin of slaveholding, is a question on which there is difference of opinion. But does it not yet stand a strong pillar of that Bulwark, in and behind which slavery "lives and moves and has its being"—and without which it could not survive a single day?—Would to heaven that it did not—that it were free from all "fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness."

But can that church be guiltless, which continues to give aid and receive letters from churches which are not only in full fellowship with, but made up in part of slaveholders? Yet the church in Oberlin does this!

Can that church be said to have washed its hands in innocence, relative to the slave, which extends the right-hand of fellowship to those ministers and churches who go up to the General Assembly and sit around its common table with slaveholders? Yet the church in Oberlin does this!

How strange that that can be thought "suitable evidence of hostility to slavery," which is consistent with following shipping the apostle for slavery—as it is!

How strange that discussion, and labored argument, should be thus necessary to settle the question, whether or not, he can be a Christian, who without a word of rebuke, can see the mother rebeld of the babe of her bosom, while nothing of the kind is necessary to prove him a sinner, who merely takes a lamb from the fold; yet so it is!

The friends of the slave had a right to expect different things of the church in Oberlin, in the account of its professions, and the high and holy ground, it has actually taken relative to the reforms in general. With pain and surprise therefore, will they see, that this church (whatever it may think of itself) does in reality form a link in the chain which not only binds down, but wears deep into the heart of the plowing husbandman.

But there is no cause for dis-encouragement, though church and state join league with the oppressors for in spite of both, he who has said, if the oppressed cry at all unto me, I will surely hear their cry, will work out their deliverance. Man will in vain devise devices, and oppose his puny arm to Almighty Power.

Yours for the slave,
Lucy Stone.

Mr. and Mrs. Foster of Oberlin.

FRIENDS EDITORS:—

In giving an account of the visit of our friends Mr. and Mrs. Foster to Oberlin, I have no other object in view than to give a few facts to the world, without which their labors here, successful or unsuccessful, will not be understood. I believe that the great mass of the people here, especially the students, believe that President Mahan achieved a complete victory over them. Perhaps there are some forty or fifty of the individuals who think the reverse. But when we take an impartial survey of all the circumstances—the deep-seated prejudice—the firm and fixed resolve to oppose them, right or wrong, (I speak now of the greater portion of the people,) we wonder that even so many as do, should sympathize with these uncompromising foes to slavery.

It will be remembered that Mr. and Mrs. Foster visited Oberlin last winter, and on account of a religious revival being then in progress, they were not permitted to have a full hearing. The Faculty at that time seemed to have no other feelings towards them than those of kindness and love. Both in public and in private they treated them as warm-hearted friends of the slave, and sincere lovers of humanity. They told them that in consequence of the revival, they would prefer not to have a discussion at that time, but if they would come at any future period they should have a full hearing. Mr. and Mrs. F.

told them that they did not believe a discussion would interfere with the revival, if it were of God; nevertheless, if it was thought best not to have a discussion, they would not persist, and so they left with the conviction that the people here were honest seekers after truth. But since they left, up to their recent visit, no stone had been left unturned to cripple their influence, and hedge up their way. For weeks after their departure sermons and lectures were interspersed with remarks designed to show that the Disunionists were seeking the utter overthrow of all government, and the destruction of all things good and holy—that co-existence was the foundation stone of all things vile and wicked. One of our most influential men, in a sermon affirmed, that with Mr. and Mrs. Foster Anti-Slavery was only a secondary object—a covert under which they might lash the church. Whilst some were holding them up to scorn, publicly from the pulpit, others were busily engaged in circulating false and slanderous reports. Whether they had any evil design in spreading these reports, I will not here express an opinion; but this much I will say, that they did not take the pains that a Christian ought to have taken, to ascertain whether these reports were false or true. Thus matters went on for a few months.

After Mr. and Mrs. Foster returned from the East last June, they wrote a letter to this place requesting that they might come and have a hearing, as the revival was then over. At a meeting of the Faculty it was decided, that it was undesirable and inadvisable for them to come. When the President informed me of this decision, I told him that on Mr. and Mrs. F. were not particularly under the direction and guidance of the Faculty, if they chose they would come and speak to the people, whether they would hear or whether they would forbear. To this the President remarked that if he were to express his own private opinion he should say: have them come; and if they did, he should prepare to meet them in discussion.

Accordingly, I informed Mr. and Mrs. Foster how matters stood, and received from them in reply, a notice that they would address the citizens of Oberlin, commencing the second Tuesday of Sept.

As soon as it was known that they were to revisit this place, the tatter's tongue was again unloosed to do its work of mischief. Not a day passed in which individuals would not come to me with language like the following: "Sir, what in the name of common sense do you mean in wanting those vile hypocrites to come here again?" "do you not know that they are devils disguised in low, degraded, filthy rags?" "infidels of all the bluest dye!" "the quintessence of all evil!"—and then concluded by saying, "I hope and pray that the Lord will put it to the minds of his people not to go near their meetings." Still one lady, a member of the church, "I will not go unless I am dragged there; but she did not say whether she was dragged there or not I cannot tell. The same woman remarked to those standing near her, at the close of the evening meeting, that "Mrs. Foster ought to be lashed and flogged."

The Sunday previous to their coming, Professor Finney, when the notices for the ensuing week were given, requested the Trustees, Faculty, &c., to meet during the intermission of the services, to consult about their having the church in which to hold their meetings. The result of their deliberations was, that they should not enter the sacred temple. Before the a termous services, I called on Professor Finney and asked him to give notice of the meeting, but he refused to do so, and remarked that if President Mahan was going to discuss with them, he might appoint his own meeting when he returned home, (as he was then gone on a journey East.) Furthermore he remarked, that if President Mahan knew what he and the rest of the Faculty knew about Mr. and Mrs. Foster, he would not be seen on the stand with them. I said to him that Mr. Mahan did know, so far as report was concerned, but I did not think him credulous enough to believe every report that he heard, especially in the absence of proof. I asked Prof. Finney if, as they had shut them out of the church, they could be permitted to go into the chapel, (a small building always open for Whig meetings, and the like pro-slavery exercises.)

He said that he did not think that the Faculty would grant them even that;—at least he should be in favor of shutting them out, so far as he was concerned. Tuesday afternoon a Faculty meeting was held to determine whether or not they should have the chapel. After due deliberation they concluded that as the colored people wanted to have Mr. & Mrs. Foster lecture, it was best to let them have the chapel. I have only made the above statements to show the feeling existing towards our friends when they came; and now I leave you to judge whether such a state of public mind would be very likely to pass a righteous decision.

Tuesday evening was occupied by Mr. & Mrs. Foster. Mr. F. proved to the satisfaction of all, that slavery was a universal sin, and the great catalogue of human crimes. Mrs. F. showed equally clear that the north were slaveholders. Wednesday evening Mr. Foster and President Mahan commenced a discussion of the question whether the constitution is, or is not a pro-slavery document. They closed it on Friday afternoon, having spoken upon it for twelve hours. The discussion was very interesting, well attended, and every thing went on finely until towards its close, when the seeming harmony was to a great degree destroyed by the President coming out and saying that he did not believe that Mr. and Mrs. Foster were sincere—that they were not laboring for the overthrow of slavery, or for the good of the slave. This intemperate remark called forth expressions of a similar kind from Mr. Foster.

This conduct in either case I condemn as ungentlemanly and out of place. At the close of the discussion, a resolution was offered to this effect, that President Mahan had gained the day. The better judgment, and good sense of Prof. Morgan prevented it from being put.

Friday evening they commenced a discussion of the church question, which closed on Saturday evening. I was not altogether pleased with this, from the fact that the parties indulged too much in personalities, the climax of which was President Mahan's closing speech, when he gave a description of co-existence.

I will give the substance of it as well as I can remember, and then close for fear you will think my commendation too long.

He said he had watched co-existence from its commencement, and had carefully studied the actions and motives of its leaders, and he had come to the conclusion that they were actuated by no other motives than those of hate and injustice—that they were opposed to every thing that is good—that he had often sought for an object to which he could compare it; but had sought in vain. But he remembered that years ago during a severe sickness while in a half-dreamy state, induced by having taken a large quantity of opium, an object presented itself before him which he believed was a real personification of co-existence. He seemed to be in a strange place and was conducted by a guide to "Paradise Lost."

Long, long, he wandered through those sooty halls, and viewed in wondering gaze "dark figures traced in fire." But there he saw nothing that would bear a comparison to co-existence. His guide then led him to another place which no words can describe. Whilst he stood, and wondered, and gazed, suddenly at his feet a monster began to rise and expand, until it had, to use his own expressive language, increased to the size of a four bushel basket. On all sides round the hideous monster, great claws sprang up, each armed with hellish diggers, and THERE, he said, he saw CO-EXISTENCE—ERISM—the object of which was to tear down and tear down and never build up.

As a rejoinder to this awful vision, Mr. Foster read the first verse of the eighteenth chapter of Revelations—and then asked the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

At the close of the meeting a prominent Whig and member of the church, (Platt and Herold) arose and presented a resolution of the audience to take their choice of definitions of co-existence—President Mahan's John the Revelator's.

Resolved, That Wm. Lloyd Garrison, in the opinion of this meeting, for the bold and intrepid stand he has taken in behalf of the American bondman, has merited for himself a crown of unfading laurels, and may justly be styled the Leonidas of the Anti-Slavery movement.

ANTI-SLAVERY BUGLE.

SALEM, OCTOBER 9, 1846.

"I love agitation when there is cause for it—the alarm bell which startles the inhabitants of a city, saves them from being burned in their beds."—Edmund Burke.

Persons having business connected with the paper, will please call on James Barnaby, corner of Main and Chesnut sts.

BLANCHARD'S MEETINGS.

We hardly know how much or how little to say about the three meetings which Jonathan Blanchard held in this place. The Methodist Meeting house was opened to him, and this fact probably called out many whose faces are set against all moral truths which do not come through the pulpit, or through some other part of the church machinery. He was of course cordially received by the clergy of the town, one of whom even went so far as publicly to declare in Blanchard's second meeting, that he took shame unto himself for his remissness in duty toward the slave. We have long been telling the clergy that they ought to be ashamed of themselves for their lukewarmness and indifference in this holy cause, and the Rev. Jacob Coon now publicly declares in effect, that we were right in this, and that he is ashamed of himself for his remissness. Let this remark lead some to expect that he will now be more zealous and faithful, we will state that the sentiment was merely uttered in prayer, and every one knows—or should know—that at such times admissions are made which mean nothing, and assertions which are designed to have no weight.

In the first meeting which Blanchard held, he dwelt upon fundamental principles, and gave a good, plain lecture. His second address—or sermon, rather—was given on Sunday evening, and in it he confused himself mainly to slavery considered as a Bible question. Of these meetings we have but little to say, but design to offer some comments upon the highly objectionable course pursued in the commencement of his discourse—which he had announced would be on the duty of christian citizens in relation to government—for he said he expected to make biblical work of it, and he did, for a weaker argument in favor of the Constitution we never listened to from one who was anything of a public speaker. The weakness of his argument, did not however, prevent him denouncing Disunion as a *Humbug*, or declaring that those of its advocates who said they paid tax to the government as they would yield their property to a highwayman, did not themselves feel it to be so. The audience probably did not know what he and we were perfectly aware of; that we had talked with him upon this point a day or two before, and had assured him that we so regarded the payment of taxes, and to be thus accused of calling it lying or what you choose—was not what we looked for from that quarter.

In the commencement of his lecture he made professions of great liberality, said he judged men by their actions and not by their belief, and soon after in his comments upon the fathers of '76, denounced those who declared they were hypocrites, and referred to the sentiments of George Washington, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson, &c., to show how exceedingly anti-slavery they were. Apply Jonathan Blanchard's rule of judgment, and what was his character? Washington held on to his slaves as long as he could hold on to anything; he sent an agent to New Hampshire to recapture one of his fugitive bondwomen; and when Edward Price, a mild and gentlemanly Quaker merchant of Liverpool, wrote him a letter soon after the close of the revolutionary war, telling him that now having gained his own freedom, it would well become him to give liberty to his slaves, he insultingly enclosed the letter in a black envelope and returned it to its author. Patrick Henry lived and died a slaveholder, as did also Jefferson, who, it is said, left his own posterity in bondage. Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, was the possessor of one thousand slaves when his life passed from him, and his death brought no jubilee to any one of them. We might enumerate other of the slaveholding fathers were it necessary, but we have named enough to show that the acts of some of those who boasted so loudly of their love of liberty, were those of the tyrant and enslaver. In the contemplation of these illustrious men, the speaker forgot his rule of judgment, his reverence became excited, and he exclaimed, "I would rather take my chance with Washington, in this world and in the world to come, than with those who call him a hypocrite." This is a queer way of judging men by their actions. A sincere, honest abolitionist, whose daily life is a testimony against slavery, believes Washington was a hypocrite, and Jonathan Blanchard would rather take his chance at the judgment seat of God with that slaveholder, than with this abolitionist. It seems then there is a sin, even greater than that of slaveholding, and that is, esteeming Washington a hypocrite.

The first ground he took against Disunion was a position in support of human government, a question entirely separate from that of slavery, and which the Disunionists have uniformly refused to discuss upon the anti-slavery platform, although Liberty party is continually logging in that extraneous topic. The second consisted in raising a false issue. He laid down this position—that it is not wrong to unite with bad men to do a good act, provided you do not thereby countenance them in their evil way. There is not a Disunionist in the land but will assent to this, and yet the speaker talked as though he believed, and wished the audience to believe, that the denial of this was a prominent article of faith in the Disunion creed. As for ourselves, we recently wrote a long editorial to prove this very position, and yet probably many were there of those who do not like to be bothered by examining both sides of the question, that really believe Disunionists oppose the doctrine. When he came to the Constitution he admitted that it was pro-slavery, admitted that for twenty years it allowed the importation of slaves; that it gave authority to the master to take back his fugitive slave whenever he might find him; and that it gave to the slaveholders a slave representation; the clause about domestic violence he very wisely refrained from alluding to. When he spoke of the duty of officers and citizens to support its slaveholding clauses, he disposed of it very summarily by saying, that these clauses were no more a part of the Constitution, than a wart on a man's face is a part of the man, and that in swearing to support the man, you do not swear to support the wart. GOVERNOR MORRIS, of Pa., one of the framers of the Constitution, said in the Convention which framed it, that "Slavery is the most prominent feature in the aristocratic countenance of the proposed Constitution."

He would sooner squander himself to a tax for paying for all the negroes in the United States, than saddle poverty with such a Constitution." So far as we can learn, there was not a single member either from the North or South but felt that the sentiment was true, that slavery was the most prominent feature of the Constitution. In regard to the clause sanctioning the foreign slave-trade, the speaker said that as that trade had expired by its own limitation, the Disunionists need have no controversy about that. A great mistake! If the trade has expired by its own limitation, the clause has not, it is yet in existence, and under it Congress, at its next session may Constitutionally re-estate the trade. It does not declare that Congress shall abolish the foreign slave-trade in 1808, but at that time simply gives it jurisdiction over the slave-trade; and our abolitionism leads us to oppose a Constitution which confers upon Congress the right to import slaves from Africa whenever it sees fit to do so; and if there were no other objectionable feature in the document, this should be sufficient of itself to condemn it in the estimation of every intelligent abolitionist. Concerning the fugitive clause he remarked, that it only required that we should not interfere to prevent the slaveholder taking back his escaping slave; and said as it was though he thought that was a trifling compromise. It only required that the people of the North should give up their soil as hunting ground for the South, that they should only stand by and see the man-stealer seize his prey, that they should only tolerate slave-catching in their midst, that they should only submit their houses to invasion and themselves to insult from the southern marauder! The latter part of the clause which declares "he shall be delivered up," was kept entirely out of sight; it did not then, perchance some of his auditors would have supposed that they, as supporters of the Constitution, were obliged to hold themselves in readiness to act as the posse of the U. S. Marshal, when he comes after the fugitive, and to aid in crushing all opposition that declares by its action "he shall not be delivered up." As to the three fifths clause, he wished it was not in the Constitution, but the framers of that document had to do the best they could under the circumstances, and they presented to have it although they did not want it.

He ridiculed the idea of secession from the government and said it was impossible; that a man was born into the government and could not get out of it. This doctrine we suppose will not apply to "women and children," seeing they are not members of the government—while only, are born with a right of citizenship. It strikes us as rather an original idea that some souls are born members of a government and can't get out of it, while others who are not born members can't get into it. Our fathers, according to English usage, were born subject-members of the government of Great Britain, but they managed to get out of it; and unless the American government is far more tyrannical than that of England, and the men of '76 far more degenerate than those of '76, we are confident that some of those yet in, will get out of it; and for the sake of securing life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness to themselves and others, will cast off that other natural right—American citizenship.

In his efforts at ridicule, the speaker evidently confounded the idea of secession from the government with that of emigration from the territory—two things having no necessary connection. "I am going to secede," said he, "and I'll turn my back on the government and go to—Jacob Heaton's. Shall I be out of the United States?" Certainly not. But he would be out of the government even there, if he was a consistent abolitionist. In his illustration of the vessel at sea, the same confusion of ideas was perceptible. He didn't like some of the regulations of the captain and other officers—they were pirates perhaps—must he therefore jump overboard and leave the vessel? Disunion does not ask this, but requires of him that he refuse to countenance the pirate laws by which the crew is governed.

We should have been glad to say in the meeting all, and more than we have said here, to show that Disunion is not a Humbug, that secession is not impracticable, and that his constitutional argument was unsound and weak, but no opportunity was offered, no invitation given. We were in hopes that after attacking the Disunionists, the lecturer would have been just enough to permit a reply. In this however we were disappointed; he did not make so much as the pause of a period between his address and prayer, nor scarcely a semicolon's intermission between his prayer and benediction. For one who professes to be a lover of free discussion, we think such a course was contemptible, and is another evidence of the unwillingness of Liberty party to bring its deeds and sentiments to the light. As soon as the benediction was concluded, the audience were of course in a state of confusion, they were already on their feet, Brod. S. Jones arrested their attention for a moment by saying that he was sorry that no opportunity had been afforded for a reply, that he regretted exceedingly that the same audience that had heard the charges which the speaker had brought against Disunionists, should not be permitted to hear their defense, and that he thought it a strange procedure for a man who professed to be an abolitionist, to take up and discuss in a public meeting a mooted point of the anti-slavery question and not permit a reply. Jonathan Blanchard saw that the Disunionists wished to reply, and a single word from his lips would have commanded the attention of the audience, and secured for the defense a respectful hearing. That word was not spoken, for he was opposed to discussion. The people might have remained as it was, but as soon as B. S. J. commenced his remarks, we saw Coon, Amherst, and Kirk, and some other of the leaders making their exit from the house, and the people soon followed their example.

The next day it was said "The Disunionists had been completely used up." We admit it. The slave is "completely used up" when his bound and bleeding form has been mangled by the lash of the driver, and the Disunionists are certainly "used up" when at all elated and misrepresented, and not permitted to show why sentence of reprobation and oblivion should not be passed upon them. It takes but little provocation and but little argument to "use up" after such a fashion.

Our apology for the length of this article must be found in the *demerit* of the *management* of the meetings referred to.

out of the United States?" Certainly not. But he would be out of the government even there, if he was a consistent abolitionist. In his illustration of the vessel at sea, the same confusion of ideas was perceptible. He didn't like some of the regulations of the captain and other officers—they were pirates perhaps—must he therefore jump overboard and leave the vessel? Disunion does not ask this, but requires of him that he refuse to countenance the pirate laws by which the crew is governed.

We should have been glad to say in the meeting all, and more than we have said here, to show that Disunion is not a Humbug, that secession is not impracticable, and that his constitutional argument was unsound and weak, but no opportunity was offered, no invitation given. We were in hopes that after attacking the Disunionists, the lecturer would have been just enough to permit a reply. In this however we were disappointed; he did not make so much as the pause of a period between his address and prayer, nor scarcely a semicolon's intermission between his prayer and benediction. For one who professes to be a lover of free discussion, we think such a course was contemptible, and is another evidence of the unwillingness of Liberty party to bring its deeds and sentiments to the light. As soon as the benediction was concluded, the audience were of course in a state of confusion, they were already on their feet, Brod. S. Jones arrested their attention for a moment by saying that he was sorry that no opportunity had been afforded for a reply, that he regretted exceedingly that the same audience that had heard the charges which the speaker had brought against Disunionists, should not be permitted to hear their defense, and that he thought it a strange procedure for a man who professed to be an abolitionist, to take up and discuss in a public meeting a mooted point of the anti-slavery question and not permit a reply. Jonathan Blanchard saw that the Disunionists wished to reply, and a single word from his lips would have commanded the attention of the audience, and secured for the defense a respectful hearing. That word was not spoken, for he was opposed to discussion. The people might have remained as it was, but as soon as B. S. J. commenced his remarks, we saw Coon, Amherst, and Kirk, and some other of the leaders making their exit from the house, and the people soon followed their example.

The next day it was said "The Disunionists had been completely used up." We admit it. The slave is "completely used up" when his bound and bleeding form has been mangled by the lash of the driver, and the Disunionists are certainly "used up" when at all elated and misrepresented, and not permitted to show why sentence of reprobation and oblivion should not be passed upon them. It takes but little provocation and but little argument to "use up" after such a fashion.

Our apology for the length of this article must be found in the *demerit* of the *management* of the meetings referred to.

Our apology for the length of this article must be found in the *demerit* of the *management* of the meetings referred to.

FRANCO-ELI ALLIANCE.

We give this week such report of the proceedings of the Alliance, together with the comments of the Liberator upon them, as will enable our readers to form a fair estimate of its anti-slavery character. We are not aware that much was expected from it, for a convention which measures the claims of applicants for membership by its notions of theology, and without reference to their living belief as a tested by their works, cannot possibly be an efficient laborer in a righteous cause. Dr. Smyth, of Charleston, a slaveholder in principle if not in fact, and who had circulated gross slanders against Frederick Douglass which he was afterwards compelled publicly to retract, was one of the links in the Evangelical Alliance; while a distinguished leader in the German Reformation, a companion and co-laborer with Rinzler, was excluded from all participation in its affairs, refused admittance to the hall in which its members convened, and left to wander the streets of London, a stranger in a strange land. Why this difference? The former was orthodox; and the latter a tyrant in principle, and a detected hypocrite in fact, these things did not invalidate his claims to orthodoxy; the latter was a reformer who placed Love above Dogmas, and Practiced righteousness above Creeds, and of course was too heterodox for the fellowship of evangelical Christians. The blind-eyed German has doubtless felt ere this, that it was an honor to be denied a membership in such a body.

While we believe the Evangelical Alliance, from the very principles of its organization, do but little if any good, it will doubtless accomplish much evil, unless its character be clearly understood, and its inclinations overthrown by fair and manly effort. It appears to us as but another church edition of the "Holy Alliance," instituted for the purpose of securing the ecclesiastical "powers that be" in possession of their authority over the bodies and souls of men; a banding together of conservatives, who, for the sake of a Union between the orthodox of all states and conditions, from the rum-seller and the slave-seller up to the purest specimens of evangelized humanity, were willing to pass by Moral Reform on the other side.

The year 1846 witnessed the birth upon English soil of two conflicting associations. One, the Anti-Slavery League, whose platform is world-wide, and who cordially invites all true opponents of slavery to stand